UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/599,810 | 06/21/2000 | Matthew J. Kotler | MSI-580US | 8040 |

22801 7590 05/06/2004

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| TRAN, QUOC A | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2176 | 8 |

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/599,810 | Applicant(s) KOTLER ET AL. |
|---|---|---|
| | Examiner Quoc A. Tran | Art Unit 2176 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 June 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-38,50,51,64,68 and 69* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *39-49,52-63,65-67 and 70-80* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-38,50,51,64,68 and 69* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *No. 6 Date12/15/03*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to application filed 06/21/2000.

2. In response to Examiner's Requirement of Election /Restriction dated 12/03/2003, Applicant elected Group I, without traverse, which includes claims 1-38, 50-51, 64, and 68-69. Claims 1, 14, 23, 32, 50, 64, and 68 are independent claims.

3. Claims 1-80 are currently pending in this application, no claim has been added, no claim has been amended, and Claims 39-49, 52-63, 65-67, and 70-80 have been withdrawn.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> **(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.**

5. **Claims 1, and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated over Koppolu et al. US Patent No. 5,801,701 issued 08/01/1998 filed 09/04/1996 (hereinafter '701).**

**In regard to independent claim 1,** "*presenting a word processing table within a document; and exhibiting spreadsheet features together with the word processing table*

*when a user is editing the word processing table",* as taught by '701 at col. 8, lines 25-32.

**In regard to dependent claim 3,** "*wherein the word processing table has rows and columns, and the exhibiting comprises depicting row headers for the rows and column headers for the columns*", as taught by '701 at col. 8, lines 40-45 (i.e. ... the row and column markers 407, are placed around the spreadsheet object ...).

6. **Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated over Ron Mansfield (hereinafter Mansfield) "Excel 97 for busy people" (Public Release 1997, By Osborne/McGraw-Hill, Berkeley, Ca, USA).**

**In regard to independent claim 64,** "*A user interface comprising: to a table having rows and columns of cells a row addition control adjacent a lowermost row in the table, the row addition control facilitating addition of one or more rows to the table; and a column addition control adjacent an outermost column in the table, the column addition control facilitating addition of one or more columns to the table"*, as taught by Mansfield, chapter 3, pages 48-50.

7. **Claim 68-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated over Sorge et al. US Patent No. 6,691,281 B1 issued 02/10/2004 filed 06/15/1999 (hereinafter '281).**

**In regard to independent claim 68,** "*A user interface comprising: a first spreadsheet table supporting spreadsheet functionality and having multiple cells; and a*

*second spreadsheet table nested within a cell of the first table",* as taught by '281 at col. 4, lines 10-20.

**In regard to independent claim 69,** "*wherein one of the first and second tables contains a formula referencing contents of the other of the first and second tables",* as taught by '281 at col. 8, lines 10-20.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 2, 4-9, and 50-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated over Koppolu et al. US Patent No. 5,801,701 issued 08/01/1998 filed 09/04/1996 (hereinafter '701), in view of Lowry et al. US Patent No. 6,549,878 B1 issued 04/15/2003 filed 12/31/19986 (hereinafter '878).**

**In regard to dependent claim 2,** '701 does not explicitly disclose, *"wherein the document is a markup document, and the presenting comprises rendering the markup document",* however '878 is taught at col. 6, lines 12-20 (i.e. ...The spreadsheet 200 is retrieved as an HTML document...).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify '701 to include document is a markup document as taught by '878 at col. 1, line 52 through col. 2, line 3, providing the benefit of minimize delivery times for user to retrieve document as needed to prepare compound document.

**Claim 4 is representing of claims 5-9, and 50.**

**In regard to dependent claim 4,** "*wherein the word processing table has rows and columns, and the exhibiting comprises depicting a row addition control for adding one or more rows to the word processing table and a column addition control for adding one or more columns to the word processing table*", as taught by '878 at col. 6, lines 25-35 (i.e. ... Rows are typically referenced with numbers, while columns are typically referenced with letters...).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify '701 to include spreadsheet features wherein the word processing table has rows/columns, formula multiple format/types of contents in cell and addition control for adding one or more rows and columns to the word processing table, as taught by '878 at col. 1, lines 13-23, providing the friendly user tools for ease of use to perform various tasks in computational projects using a word processing computer program.

**In regard to dependent claim 5,** "*determining, upon selection of a cell in the word processing table, a type of contents in the cell; and interpreting user entry based upon the type of contents in the cell* ", as taught by '878 at col. 2, lines 5-16 (i.e. During use of a spreadsheet, a user needs to have a simple and effective method for editing

the contents of a given cell. Editing may be defined as providing the ability to change all or just a portion of the contents of a cell...).

**In regard to dependent claim 6,** "*evaluating whether the type of contents is a formula or non-text data; if the type of contents is a formula or non-text data, interpreting the user entry as applicable to spreadsheet functions; and if the type of contents is not a formula or non-text data, interpreting the user entry as applicable to word processing functions.*", as taught by '878 at col. 6, lines 35-63 (i.e. Cells contain various forms of data: data may be numbers, letters, formulae... Edit mode allows a user to manipulate or change the contents of the cell 220, rather than the cell itself).

**In regard to dependent claim 7,** "*evaluating whether the type of contents is a formula if the type of contents is a formula, highlighting all of the formula and allowing editing in a formula edit box; and if the type of contents is not a formula, placing a cursor in the cell*", as taught by '878 at col. 6, lines 35-63 (i.e. Cells contain various forms of data: data may be numbers, letters, formulae) also at col. 3, lines 27-50 (i.e. ... An indication that a cell has been selected is then generated... edit mode is entered for the edit cell (formerly the selected cell.) The edit mode allows for editing the contents of the edit cell in accordance with the wishes of the user... the position data is indicative of the position of the input device indicator, is also received. Coupled with this is an indication from the input device that the edit cell has been selected, typically in the form of a mouse button depressed signal while the input device indicator is positioned over the edit cell...).

**In regard to dependent claim 8,** "*wherein the word processing table has multiple cells, the method further comprising overlaying a formula edit box on a particular cell in the table to facilitate user entry of a formula into the particular cell* ", as taught by '878 at col. 6, lines 35-54 (i.e. Cells ...), and also at col. 8 lines 40-44 (i.e. ... overlap adjacent cells...).

**In regard to dependent claim 9,** "*resizing the formula edit box as the user enters the formula, while maintaining the particular cell and table as a whole at a constant size*", as taught by '878 at col. 8, lines 50-54 (i.e. the spill text cell 500 is resized so that its size is the same as it was before edit mode was entered. Spill text need not be words; it may be numbers or formulae as well).

**In regard to independent claim 50,** incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1, and 5 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale,

*"enabling a user to format the text according to a particular format; and formatting cells in the spreadsheet table according to the particular format"* , as taught by '878 at col. 6, lines 35-54 (i.e. ... Cells contain various forms of data: data may be numbers, letters, formulae, or any combination thereof... An exemplary embodiment operates in two different modes: select mode and edit mode. Select mode allows a user to select, manipulate, move, or copy a cell, in addition to other actions. Essentially, any action that is not taken while in edit mode is part of select mode. Select mode is discussed in particular detail with respect to FIG. 3. Edit mode allows a user to manipulate or

change the contents of the cell 220, rather than the cell itself. Edit mode is discussed in particular detail with respect to FIGS. 4 through 6.).

**In regard to dependent claim 51,** is directed to a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 50, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

9. **Claims 10-15,19-26, 28-35, and 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated over Koppolu et al. US Patent No. 5,801,701 issued 08/01/1998 filed 09/04/1996 (hereinafter '701), in view of Gibb et al. US Patent No. 6,225,996 B1 issued 05/01/2001 filed 02/20/1998 (hereinafter '996).**

**Claim 10 is representing of claim 11.**

**In regard to dependent claim 10,** "*presenting multiple word processing tables*", as taught by '701 at col. 13, lines 7-15 (i.e. FIG. 12 is a diagram showing the component windows of a typical Multiple Document Interface application. A typical MDI application allows a user to edit multiple compound documents from within the same container application...).

'701 does not explicitly disclose, *"enabling a user to reference a cell in a first word processing table when entering a formula in a cell in a second word processing table*", however '966 is taught at col. 8, lines 11-19 (i.e. ... changes are then reflected in the original location of the selected ... if the selected cell contains a formula, the user can edit the formula itself...).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify '701 to enabling a user to reference a cell in a first word processing table when entering a formula in a cell in a second word processing table, as taught by '966 at col. 2, lines 40-45, providing the friendly user tools for ease of use to perform various tasks in computational projects using a word processing computer program, where the contents of a first cell may depend upon values entered in other, widely separated cells, so that the user may wish to change values in some cells while viewing the results of such changes in the first cell.

**In regard to dependent claim 11,** "*presenting a free floating field; and enabling a user to reference a cell in the word processing table when entering a formula into the free floating field*", as taught by '966 at col. 2, lines 45-67 through col. 3, lines 1-2 (i.e. ... the display field is located in a status bar and is therefore separate from the on-screen window showing the active document...If the contents of the cell change, the display field is updated accordingly, to reflect the change...).

**In regard to dependent claim 12,** '701 does not explicitly discloses, "*modifying a value in a cell of the word processing table; and upon modification, automatically recalculating any formula in the word processing table that is affected by the modification*", however is taught by '996 at col. 2, lines 65-67 through col. 3, lines 1-2 (i.e. ... Such changes are reflected in the original location of the selected cell as well as in the display field).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify '701 to enabling a user to modify a value in a cell of the word

processing table; and upon modification, automatically recalculating any formula in the word processing table that is affected by the modification, as taught by '966 at col. 2, lines 40-45, providing the friendly user tools for ease of use to perform various tasks in computational projects using a word processing computer program, where the contents of a first cell may depend upon values entered in other, widely separated cells, so that the user may wish to change values in some cells while viewing the results of such changes in the first cell.

**In regard to dependent claim 13,** is directed to a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 1 and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**Claim 14 is representing of claims 15, 19-21.**

**In regard to independent claim 14,** incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 3 above, and in further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale;

"*overlaying a formula edit box on a particular cell in the table to facilitate user entry of a formula into the particular cell*", as taught by '996 at col. 8, lines 11-19 (i.e. ... selected cell contains a formula, the user can edit the formula itself by clicking on display field 602 and entering input via a keyboard.)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify '701 to include a formula edit box, where is overlaying on a particular cell in the table to facilitate user entry of a formula into the particular cell, as taught by '966 at col. 2, lines 40-45, providing the friendly user tools for ease of use to perform various tasks in computational projects using a word processing computer

program, where the contents of a first cell may depend upon values entered in other, widely separated cells, so that the user may wish to change values in some cells while viewing the results of such changes in the first cell.

**In regard to dependent claim 15,** "*wherein the formula edit box initially defaults to a size and shape of the particular cell in the table*", as taught by '996 at col. 2, lines 65-67 through col. 7, lines 30-40 (i.e. ... display field 602 provides a stable, persistent indicator of the value of the contents of the selected cell...).

**In regard to dependent claim 19,** "*enabling a user to reference another cell in the table to add a reference to the formula",* as taught by '996 at col. 8, lines 11-19 (i.e. ... changes are then reflected in the original location of the selected ... if the selected cell contains a formula, the user can edit the formula itself...).

**In regard to dependent claim 20,** "*presenting multiple tables*", as taught by '701 at col. 13, lines 7-15 (i.e. FIG. 12 is a diagram showing the component windows of a typical Multiple Document Interface application. A typical MDI application allows a user to edit multiple compound documents from within the same container application...),

"*and to enabling a user to reference a cell in another table to add a variant to the formula",* as taught by '996 at col. 8, lines 11-19 (i.e. ... changes are then reflected in the original location of the selected ... if the selected cell contains a formula, the user can edit the formula itself...).

**In regard to dependent claim 21,** "*presenting a free floating field; and enabling a user to reference the free floating field to add a variant to the formula*", as taught by '996 at col. 2, lines 45-67 through col. 3, lines 1-2 (i.e. ... the display field is located in a

status bar and is therefore separate from the on-screen window showing the active document...If the contents of the cell change, the display field is updated accordingly, to reflect the change...).

**In regard to dependent claim 22,** is directed to a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 14 and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**In regard to independent claim 23,** incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 10 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 24, and 28** incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1, and 10 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 25,** incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 26,** incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 10, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 29,** incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 12, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 30,** incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 11, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 31,** is directed to a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 23, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

**In regard to independent claim 32,** incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 10 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claims 33-34,** incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 35,** incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 12, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 37,** incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 21, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

**In regard to dependent claim 38,** is directed to a computer readable medium for performing the method of claim 23, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

10. **Claims 16-18, 27, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated over Koppolu et al. US Patent No. 5,801,701 issued 08/01/1998 filed 09/04/1996 (hereinafter '701), in view of Gibb et al. US Patent No. 6,225,996 B1 issued 05/01/2001 filed 02/20/1998 (hereinafter '996), and in further view of Lowry et al. US Patent No. 6,549,878 B1 issued 04/15/2003 filed 12/31/19986 (hereinafter '878).**

**Claim 16 is representing of claims 17-18, 27, and 36.**

**In regard to dependent claim 16,** '701 and '996 do not explicitly disclose, "*resizing the formula edit box as the user enters the formula*", however '878 is taught at

col. 8, lines 40-53 (i.e. ... resized so that its size is the same as it was before edit mode was entered...).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify '701 and '996 to include a formula edit box, where the formula edit box resizes as the user enters the formula, as taught by '878 at col. 8, lines 43-44, providing more space to display the data within its boundary, SPILL text allows a user to see all the data contained in the cell, thus simplifying the editing process upon perform various tasks in computational projects using a word processing computer program.

**In regard to dependent claim 17,** "*resizing the formula edit box as the user enters the formula, while maintaining the particular cell and table at a constant size.*" however is taught in '878 col. 8, lines 40-53 is taught in '878 col. 6, lines 35-54 (i.e. Cells ...), and also taught in '878 col. 8 lines 40-44 (i.e. ... overlap adjacent cells...).

**In regard to dependent claim 18,** "*extending the formula edit box horizontally and subsequently enlarging the formula edit box vertically as the user enters the formula*" however is taught in '878 col. 8, lines 38-53 (i.e. ... spill text cell 500 has been designated as the edit cell. When the edit cell 400 of FIG. 4 contains more data than can be displayed within its boundary, the edit cell is expanded to overlap adjacent cells. The text thus "spills" across cells located to the right of the edit cell, thereby creating the spill text cell 500... Spill text need not be words; it may be numbers or formulae as well).

**In regard to dependent claim 27, "***overlaying a formula edit box on the second cell in the second table to facilitate user entry of the formula into the second cell,*" as taught by '878 at col. 8, lines 40-44 (i.e. ... overlap adjacent cells...).

**In regard to dependent claim 36,** "*facilitating user selection of a cell in the first table using a pointer to create a variant in the formula*", as taught by '878 at col. 3, lines 27-50 (i.e. ... An indication that a cell has been selected is then generated... n edit mode is entered for the edit cell (formerly the selected cell.) The edit mode allows for editing the contents of the edit cell in accordance with the wishes of the user... the position data is indicative of the position of the input device indicator, is also received. Coupled with this is an indication from the input device that the edit cell has been selected, typically in the form of a mouse button depressed signal while the input device indicator is positioned over the edit cell...).

***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Jamshidi et al | U.S. Patent No. 6,631,497B1 | issued 10/07/2003 | filed 07/19/1999 |
| Salas et al. | U.S. Patent No. 5,317,686 | issued 05/31/1994 | filed 03/10/1993 |
| Greif et al. | U.S. Patent No. 5,371,675 | issued 12/06/1994 | filed 06/03/1992 |
| Bricklin et al. | U.S. Patent No. 5,717,939 | issued 02/10/1998 | filed 11/17/1995 |

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-8781. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

---

***Quoc A. Tran***
***Patent Examiner***
***Technology Center 2176***
***April 21, 2004***

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER